

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,110	12/27/2005	David Peter Wharton	130098-1001	3572
65482 7590 11/23/2009 Law Offices of Tim Headley 7941 Katy Fwy, Suite 506 Houston, TX 77024-1924			EXAMINER	
			OSTRUP, CLINTON T	
Houston, TX 7	7/024-1924		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3771	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/23/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

tim.headley@headleyiplaw.com weston.stewart@headleyiplaw.com tim.headley@gmail.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/535,110	WHARTON ET AL.		
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	CLINTON OSTRUP	3771		
All Participants:	Status of Application: Am	<u>ended</u>		
(1) <u>Clinton Ostrup</u> .	(3)			
(2) <u>Tim Headley</u> .	(4)	(4)		
Date of Interview: 17 November 2009	Time: <u>4:30 pm</u>			
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)			
Part I.				
Rejection(s) discussed:				
Proposed 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejections were discuexaminer to obviate the proposed rejections.	issed and alternative claim languag	ge was suggested by the		
Claims discussed: 1, 6, 9, 13, 16, 17, 22, 27, 29, 33, 34, and 54.				
Prior art documents discussed: None				
Part II.				
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:		
Part III.				
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	ne examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview		
/Steven O. Douglas/				
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3771	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)		

Application No. 10/535,110

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed Mr. Headley that he was trying to get this application in condition for allowance; however, there were miror objectionable and/or rejectionable issues in the claims that needed to be addressed. Claims 1, 6, 9, 13, 16, 17, 22, 27, 29, 33, 34, and 54 were discussed and alternative claim language and/or pructuation was agreed upon to overcome the examiners concerns. It was also agreed that claim in 6 would be cancelled due to its ambiguous "detour pathway" not defined in the specification or shown in the drawings. It was agreed that these changes would be made by examiner's amendment.